

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 10-28 are pending in the application, with claims 10, 18, and 21 being the independent claims. The independent claims have been amended. Support for the amendment of these claims is found in the Specification at least at para. 0134 – 0138, and in FIGs. 6B and 6C. Dependent claims 11-17, 19, and 20 have been amended for clarity. In addition, claims 22-28 have been added. These represent system and computer readable medium claims that correspond to existing method claims. These changes and additions introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,757,920 (“Misra”). Applicants respectfully disagree and further believe that this claim is patentable in its present form over the applied reference. Nonetheless, Applicants hereby amend claim 10 to clarify that the steps of (c) reconfiguring the first server machine to prevent further access by the user to the secured item via the first server machine, and (d) reconfiguring the second server machine to permit access by the user to the secured item via the second server machine, take place upon receiving the current

access request to access the secured item via the second server machine. The execution of these steps under this condition is not disclosed by Misra. For at least this reason, this reference fails to anticipate claim 10 as amended.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 11-17 as anticipated by Misra. Claims 11-17 depend from claim 10 as amended, and include all features thereof. Because Misra fails to disclose all features of claim 10 as amended, this reference likewise fails to disclose all features of any of claims 11-17. For at least this reason, none of claims 11-17 is anticipated by Misra.

Claim 18 has also been rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Misra. Applicants respectfully disagree and further believe that this claim is patentable in its present form over the applied reference. Nonetheless, claim 18 has been amended to recite computer program code for reconfiguring the first server machine to prevent further access by the user to the secured item via the first server machine upon receiving the current access request to access the secured item via the second server machine. Claim 18 has also been amended to recite computer program code for reconfiguring the second server machine to permit access by the user to the secured item via the second server machine upon receiving the current access request to access the secured item via the second server machine. These features are not disclosed by Misra. For at least this reason, claim 18 as amended is not anticipated by this reference.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 19 and 20 as being anticipated by Misra. These claims depend from claim 18 as amended, and include all features thereof. Because Misra fails to disclose all features of claim 18 as amended, this reference

likewise fails to disclose all features of either claim 19 or 20. For at least this reason, neither claim 19 nor claim 20 is anticipated by Misra.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 21 as being anticipated by Misra.

Applicants respectfully disagree and further believe that this claim is patentable in its present form over the applied reference. Nonetheless, claim 21 has been amended to recite means for reconfiguring the first server machine to prevent further access by the user to the secured item via the first server machine upon receiving the current access request to access the secured item via the second server machine. Claim 21 has also been amended to recite means for reconfiguring the second server machine to permit access by the user to the secured item via the second server machine upon receiving the current access request to access the secured item via the second server machine. These features are not disclosed by Misra. For at least this reason, claim 21 is not anticipated by this reference.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: APRIL 20, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

iM 666429